1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
3	AT WINCHESTER
4	:
5	TONY A. GUNTER, :
6	Plaintiff, :
7	v. : 4:16-CV-37 :
8	BEMIS COMPANY, INC., :
9	Defendant. :
10	Chattanooga, Tennessee April 14, 2017
11	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE TRAVIS R. McDONOUGH UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	APPEARANCES:
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
14	HEATHER MOORE COLLINS
15	ANNE HUNTER WILLIAMS Collins & Hunter, PLLC
16	7000 Executive Center Drive, Suite 320 Brentwood, Tennessee 37027
17	22011011000000 07027
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19	JONATHAN O. HARRIS THOMAS W. WHITWORTH
20	Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.
21	SunTrust Plaza, Suite 1200 401 Commerce Street
22	Nashville, Tennessee 37219
23	
24	JURY TRIAL FIFTH DAY OF TRIAL
25	FIFTH DAT OF INTAL

(The proceedings were held outside the presence of 1 2. the jury, as follows:) THE COURT: All right. Good morning --3 4 MR. HARRIS: Good morning. 5 THE COURT: -- everybody. The first thing I want to 6 do is -- before I charge the jury, is just to confirm what I 7 think everybody already knows with regard to the remedies available to the jury, that I'm going to find that 8 9 reinstatement in this case is not feasible. The -- although 10 the plaintiff testified that he would like to have his job 11 back, the defendant has put on proof that it's not, in its 12 opinion, safe to do so. 13 And while the defendant has pointed to the 14 plaintiff's request to be reinstated as a potential reason not 15 to make front pay available as a remedy, I don't -- I have not 16 heard the defendant put on any evidence that -- or make a 17 request that it has actually requested that the Court consider 18 reinstatement. So I'll give you-- Are there any objections 19 to that ruling? 20 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, the defendants, again, 21 object. And it's very clear that reinstatement is the 2.2 preferred remedy. That's what the law says. The reason this 23 man was fired was because of our determination he could not be 24 reasonably accommodated. But if the jury disagrees with us, 25 then they're necessarily finding that he's qualified to perform

```
the essential functions of the job and therefore disagreeing
 1
 2
     with our view of whether he could do it or not. He says he
     wants his job back. It is not our burden to prove
 3
 4
     reinstatement is feasible; it's the plaintiff's burden to show
 5
     why it is not. And just like we follow doctors' orders, we
 6
     follow judges' orders. If the Judge says he goes back, he goes
 7
     back. That's our objection.
               THE COURT: Okay. Anything from the plaintiff?
 8
              MS. COLLINS: No, Your Honor.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MS. COLLINS: What you said makes sense.
11
12
               THE COURT: All right. We have, after a few
1.3
    machinations and some more work, I think, arrived at a much
14
    better verdict form than we discussed yesterday. You have a
15
     copy of that verdict form, which is what will go back to the
16
     jury. And I will give you a chance now to make any objections
17
     to the form that you've not already made. Are there any
18
     objections?
19
               MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, with respect, we -- we
20
     object to the verdict form. As far as the good faith defense,
21
     it is our view that because this entire case revolves around a
2.2
    reasonable accommodation scenario, the good faith defense
23
     should apply to all the claims in this case. And so we lodge
24
     that objection.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
```

```
MR. HARRIS: And that's it.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 3
               All right. Ms. Collins, Ms. Hunter, anything to
 4
     add?
 5
               MS. COLLINS: Nothing to add, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. With regard to the jury
 7
     instructions, we made a few little changes -- couple of little
     changes this morning. Let me just review those with you and
 8
 9
     give you an opportunity to object if there is an issue.
10
               So on Page 30, Jury Instruction Number 27, I have
11
     changed -- in the last sentence, I'm using the word -- or the
    phrase "actual damages" instead of "compensatory damages,"
12
13
     which was on the version that we discussed yesterday.
14
     there any objection to that change?
15
               MR. WHITWORTH: No objection.
16
               MS. COLLINS: No objection.
17
               THE COURT: All right. And then we did not discuss
18
     this, but on Page 33, Jury Instruction Number 30, it previously
19
     read "marshal," and I'm going to make that "courtroom deputy."
20
     So tell me now if you have an objection.
21
               And on Page 34, within the same instruction, as we
2.2
    dis- -- as we -- as you know, I'm going to, at the very end,
23
     tell the jury that I will -- quote, "I will now review the
24
     verdict form with you, " and then I'll go over the verdict form
25
     that we've just discussed.
```

5

```
1
               Are there any objections to those changes?
 2.
              MR. WHITWORTH: No objection.
 3
              MS. COLLINS: No objection.
 4
               THE COURT: All right. Anything else to take up
 5
    before we bring the jury in and charge the jury?
 6
               MS. COLLINS: Your Honor, could I have an updated set
 7
     of the jury instructions? I can't seem to find mine from last
 8
    night. I'm sorry.
 9
               THE COURT: You should have the one from this
10
    morning, right? Didn't we pass that out?
11
              MS. COLLINS: No. I got the verdict form.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a new version,
1.3
    Mr. Harris?
14
              MR. HARRIS: I don't think we do, Judge.
15
               THE COURT: Let's make sure that he does, too,
16
    before --
17
               MS. HUNTER: Yeah, if there was more copies, that
18
     would be great.
19
               MR. HARRIS: And, Judge, just from a procedural
20
     standpoint, after you read in the objections, so that we can
21
    preserve them, how do you handle that? Can we just say, "Your
2.2
    Honor, we renew our objections as previously discussed"?
23
               THE COURT: After the instructions?
24
               MR. HARRIS: Yeah.
25
               THE COURT:
                           I think you've preserved your objections
```

```
to the substance. When I ask you for objections after the
 1
 2.
     charge --
 3
               MR. HARRIS: Uh-huh.
 4
               THE COURT: -- what I'm really asking is, did I mess
 5
     up reading that. And you can let me know.
 6
               MR. HARRIS: And the cautious person inside of me,
 7
     reading Sixth Circuit case law, thinks we have to renew.
 8
               THE COURT: I'm-- If you need to do that, I'll --
 9
     that's fine.
10
               MR. HARRIS: Okay.
11
               THE COURT: Just wait until we dismiss the jury.
12
               MR. HARRIS: Okay.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Okay. Let's bring them in,
14
    Ms. Hinton.
15
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay.
16
               (Brief pause.)
17
               (The jury entered the courtroom, and the proceedings
18
               continued as follows:)
19
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ladies and
20
     gentlemen. Good morning. At this point I'm going to give you
21
     your charge. I'm going to read the jury instructions to you.
2.2
     This will probably, I'd say, take more or less a half hour. So
23
    be patient, and listen intently, please.
24
               Members of the jury, now it is time for me to
25
     instruct you about the law that you must follow in deciding
```

the case. At the start of this case I gave you some guidelines on the applicable law. I will now instruct you on the law that you should use in reaching your verdict. These instructions on the applicable law supersede any earlier statements on the law which I gave you at the start of the case.

1.3

2.2

I will start by explaining your duties and the general duties that -- general rules that apply in every civil case. Then I will explain some rules that you must use in evaluating particular testimony and evidence. And last I will explain the law relating to the claims made in the plaintiff's case. Please listen very carefully to everything I say.

You have two main duties as jurors. The first is to decide what the facts are from the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Deciding the facts is your job, not mine, and nothing that I have said or done during this trial was meant to influence your decision about the facts in any way.

Your second duty is to take the law that I give you, apply it to the facts, and decide whether the plaintiff has established that the defendant terminated his employment because of his disability, in violation of the ADA, the Americans with Disabilities Act.

It is my job to instruct you about the law, and you are bound by the oath that you took at the beginning of the

trial to follow the instructions that I give you, even if you personally disagree with them. This includes the instructions that I gave you before and during the trial and these instructions. All the instructions are important, and you should consider them together as a whole.

2.2

The lawyers have talked about the law during their arguments, but if what they said is different from what I say, you must follow what I say. What I say about the law controls.

Perform these duties fairly. Do not let any bias, sympathy, or prejudice that you may feel toward one side or the other influence your decision in any way. The Court, the parties, and the public expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all of the evidence in the case, follow the law as stated to you by the Court, and arrive at a verdict that you think is just, fair, and right under the proof.

Now, let's talk for a moment about evidence. You are to decide this case only from the evidence which was presented at this trial. The evidence consists of (1) the sworn testimony of the witnesses who have testified, both in person and by deposition, (2) the exhibits that were received and marked as evidence, (3) any facts to which all the lawyers have agreed or stipulated, and (4) any other matters that I have instructed you to consider as evidence.

By contrast, the questions of a lawyer are not to be

considered by you as evidence. It is the witness's answers that are evidence, not the questions directed at them. At times a lawyer may have incorporated into a question a statement which assumed certain facts to be true, and asked the witness if the statement was true. If the witness denies the truth of the statement, and if there is no evidence proving that assumed fact to be true, then you may not consider it to be true simply because it was contained in the lawyer's question.

2.1

2.2

2.5

Testimony that has been stricken or excluded is not evidence and may not be considered by you in rendering your verdict. Also, if certain testimony was received for a limited purpose only, such as for the purpose of assessing a witness's credibility, you must follow the limiting instructions I have given.

Arguments by lawyers are not evidence because the lawyers are not witnesses. What they have said to you in their opening and closing statements is intended solely to help you understand the evidence in order to reach your verdict. If your recollection of the facts differs from the lawyers' statements, it is your recollection which controls.

To be evidence, exhibits must be received into evidence. Exhibits marked for identification but not admitted are not evidence nor are materials brought forth only to refresh a witness's recollection.

Finally, statements which I may have made concerning the quality of the evidence are not evidence. It is for you alone to decide the weight, if any, to be given to the testimony you have heard and the exhibits you have seen.

2.1

2.2

There are two types of evidence, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is simply evidence, like the testimony of an eyewitness which, if you believe it, directly proves is fact. If a witness testified that he saw it raining outside, and you believed him, that would be direct evidence that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly prove a fact. If someone walked into the courtroom wearing a raincoat covered with drops of water and carrying a wet umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude that it was raining.

It is your job to decide how much weight to give to direct and circumstantial evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight that you should give to either one or say that one is any better evidence than the other. You should consider all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.

You should use your common sense in weighing the evidence. Consider it in light of your everyday experience

with people and events, and give it whatever weight you 1 2. believe it deserves. 3 You are the sole and exclusive judges of the 4 credibility or believability of the witnesses who have 5 testified in this case. You must decide which witnesses you 6 believe and how important you think their testimony is. You 7 are not required to accept or reject everything a witness 8 says. You are free to believe all, none, or part of a 9 person's testimony. 10 In deciding which testimony you believe, you should 11 rely on your own common sense and everyday experience. There 12 is no fixed set of rules to use in deciding whether you 13 believe a witness, but it may help you to think about the 14 following questions: 15 (1) Was the witness able to see, hear, or be aware 16 of the things about which the witness testified? 17 (2) How well was the witness able to recall and 18 describe those things? 19 (3) How long was the witness watching or listening? 20 (4) Was the witness distracted in any way? 2.1 (5) Did the witness have a good memory? 2.2 (6) Did the witness look and act while tes- -- how 23 did the witness look and act while testifying? 24 (7) Was the witness making an honest effort to tell 25 the truth, or did the witness evade questions?

1	(8) Did the witness have any interest in the outcome
2	of the case?
3	(9) Did the witness have any motive, bias, or
4	prejudice that would influence the witness's testimony?
5	(10) How reasonable was the witness's testimony when
6	you consider all of the evidence in the case?
7	(11) Was the witness's testimony contradicted by
8	what that witness has said or done at another time, by the
9	testimony of other witnesses, or by other evidence?
10	(12) Has there been evidence regarding the witness's
11	intelligence, respectability, or reputation for truthfulness?
12	(13) Has the witness's testimony been influenced by
13	any promises, threats, or suggestions?
14	(14) Did the witness admit that any part of the
15	witness's testimony was not true?
16	Now, a witness may be discredited or impeached by
17	contradictory evidence or by evidence that at some other time
18	the witness has said or done something or has failed to say or
19	do something that is inconsistent with the witness's present
20	testimony. If you believe any witness has been impeached and
21	thus discredited, you may give the testimony of that witness
22	such credibility, if any, you think it deserves.
23	If a witness is shown knowingly to have testified
24	falsely under oath about any material matter, you have the
25	right to distrust such witness's other testimony, and you may

reject all of the testimony of that witness or give it such credibility as you may think it deserves.

2.2

An act or omission is knowingly done if voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident or some other innocent reason.

Now, the law does not require any party to call as witnesses all persons who may have been present at any time or place involved in the case or who may appear to have some knowledge of the matters in issue in this trial. Nor does the law require that any -- any party to produce as exhibits all papers and all things mentioned in the evidence in the case.

Let me talk to you for a moment about the burden of proof. The plaintiff has the burden of proof in this case. The party who has the burden of proof must carry that burden by a preponderance of the evidence. This means simply the greater weight of the evidence. It may be helpful -- if may be helpful to envision a set of balancing scales. After considering all the proof on a particular element of the plaintiff's case, the scales must be tipped in favor of the plaintiff on that issue for the plaintiff to prevail on that issue. If the weight of the evidence is equally balanced, or if you are unable to determine which side of an issue has the preponderance, the plaintiff does not prevail on that issue.

A preponderance of the evidence, thus, means such evidence as, when considered and compared with that opposed to

it, has more convincing force and produces in your minds a belief that what is sought to be proved is more likely true than not true. In other words, to establish a claim by a preponderance of the evidence merely means to prove that the claim is more likely so than not so. Mere speculation or mere possibility is not sufficient to support a judgment in plaintiff's favor.

2.2

In determining whether any fact in issue has been proved by a preponderance of the evidence, you should consider the testimony of all the witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and all the exhibits received in evidence, regardless of who may have produced them.

Let me talk a bit more about preponderance of the evidence. As I said, it's the plaintiff's burden to prove every element of his claim by a preponderance of the evidence. If the plaintiff should fail to establish any element of his claim by a preponderance of the evidence, you should find for defendant as to that claim.

To establish something by a preponderance of the evidence means to prove that something is more likely so than not so. In other words, a preponderance of the evidence means such evidence as, when considered and compared with the evidence opposed to it, has more convincing force and produces in your minds belief that what is sought to be proved is more likely true than not true. This standard does not require

proof to an absolute certainty, since proof to an absolute certainty is seldom possible in any case.

1.3

2.2

You may have heard of the term <u>proof beyond a</u>

<u>reasonable doubt</u>. That is a stricter standard that applies in criminal cases. It does not apply in civil cases such as this. You should therefore put it out of your minds.

Now, this case is about — this case should be considered and decided by you as an action between persons of equal worth and equal standing in the community. Corporations like the defendant are entitled to the same fair trial at your hands as a private individual. All persons, including individuals and corporations, stand equal before the law, and are to be dealt with as equals in a court of justice.

I also instruct you that sympathy or hostility must not enter into your deliberation as jurors no matter what your sympathy or hostility may lead you to think. Neither sympathy nor hostility has any place in a trial of a lawsuit or in the making up of your minds as to what your verdict shall be. Do not permit any such emotional considerations to enter into your deliberations at all.

So let's talk about the causes of actions. The Americans with Disabilities Act, referred to frequently as the ADA, prohibits an employer from discriminating against an employee with a disability if that employee is otherwise qualified to perform the essential functions of his or her job

with or without reasonable accommodation. In this case plaintiff claims that defendant discriminated against him by (1) failing to engage in an interactive process with him in good faith, (2) failing to provide him with a reasonable accommodation, and (3) terminating his employment because of disability. Defendant denies the plaintiff's claims.

1.3

2.2

To prove a claim for discriminatory discharge in violation of the ADA, plaintiff must first prove by a preponderance of the evidence that (1) during the relevant time frame of his employment with defendant, plaintiff had a disability—and I will define the term disability for you later—(2) he was qualified to perform all of the essential functions of his job as a press assistant, with or without a reasonable accommodation—again, I'll define the terms essential function and reasonable accommodation for you—and (3) defendant terminated his employment because of a disability.

If you find that plaintiff has proven all three of these elements by a preponderance of the evidence, your verdict on plaintiff's discharge claim must be in favor of plaintiff. If you find that plaintiff has failed to prove all three of these elements by a preponderance of the evidence, your verdict on plaintiff's discharge claim must be in favor of defendant.

At all times the burden of persuasion is on the

plaintiff to prove that the defendant terminated his employment because of disability discrimination.

2.2

To prove his claim that defendant violated the ADA by failing to provide him with a reasonable accommodation of a disability, plaintiff must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that (1) he had a disability at the time he was employed by the defendant, (2) he was qualified — he was a qualified individual able to perform the essential functions of his job as a press assistant, (3) he requested that defendant provide him with a reasonable accommodation of his disability, and (4) defendant failed to provide a reasonable accommodation.

If you find that plaintiff has proven all four of these elements by a preponderance of the evidence, your verdict must be in favor of plaintiff. If you find that plaintiff has failed to prove all four of these elements by a preponderance of the evidence, your verdict must be in favor of defendant.

Let's talk about the definition of <u>disabled</u>. In order to prove his claim that defendant failed to provide him with a reasonable accommodation and/or discriminated against him based on a disability, plaintiff must first prove that he was disabled as defined by the ADA.

A disability is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities.

You should apply the term <u>disability</u> broadly. As amended by the ADAAA, another act, the ADA defines <u>major life activities</u> as including, but not limited to, caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, seeing, hearing, eating, sleeping, walking, standing, lifting, bending, speaking, breathing, learning, reading, concentrating, thinking, communicating, and working. A major life activity also includes the operation of a major bodily function, including, but not limited to, the immune system, cell growth, digestion, elimination (bowel and bladder), the nervous system, the brain, the respiratory system, circulation, the endocrine system, and the reproductive system.

2.2

In determining whether plaintiff's impairment substantially limits a major life activity, you should compare his ability to perform a major life activity with that of the average person. In doing so, you should consider (1) the nature and severity of the impairment, (2) how long the impairment will last or is expected to last, and (3) the permanent or long-term impact or expected impact of the impairment. Temporary impairments with little or no long-term impact are not sufficient. In determining whether an impairment substantially limits a major life activity, you must consider the impairment without regard to the effects of such measures as medication, therapies, or surgery. In doing so, you may consider evidence of the expected course of a

1 particular disorder without medication, therapies, or surgery. 2 Let's discuss the definition of substantially 3 limited. Under the ADA an impairment substantially limits a 4 major life activity if it prevents or severely restricts 5 plaintiff in comparison to the average person in the general 6 population. Working is a major life activity. An impairment 7 need not prevent or significantly or severely restrict the individual from performing a major life activity in order to 8 9 be considered substantially limiting. Nonetheless, not every 10 impairment will constitute a disability within the meaning of 11 this section. Only impairments with permanent or long-term impact are disabilities under the ADA. 12 13 Now let's discuss the definition of qualified. 14 Under the ADA, plaintiff was qualified if he had the skill, 15 experience, education, and other requirements for the job and 16 could do the job's essential functions, either with or without 17 a reasonable accommodation. You should only consider 18 plaintiff's abilities at the time when defendant placed him 19 out of work in July 2014. 20 Not all job functions are essential. Essential job 21 functions are a job's fundamental duties. In deciding whether 2.2 a function is essential, you may consider the reasons the job 23 exists, the number of employees defendant has to do that kind

of work, the degree of specialization the job requires,

defendant's judgment about what is required (for example, his

24

25

job description), the consequences of not requiring an 2 employee to satisfy that job -- that function, and the work 3 experience of others who held the position.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Now let's discuss the definition of essential In order to be otherwise qualified for the position under the ADA, plaintiff must prove that he could perform the essential functions of his job with or without a reasonable accommodation. The phrase essential functions of the job means the fundamental duties of the job the plaintiff was required to perform.

In determining whether a job duty is an essential function, you may consider (1) the employer's judgment as to which functions are essential, (2) the written job description for the position, (3) the amount of time spent performing the function, (4) the consequences of not requiring the employee to perform the function, (5) the work experience of past employees in the job, (6) the current work experience of persons with similar jobs; and/or (7) who has performed the function in practice. A job function that is only occasionally performed may still be necessary and considered an essential function of the job. No one of these factors is controlling.

Let's discuss reasonable accommodation. Under the ADA, to accommodate a disability is to make some change that will let a person with a disability perform his job. An

accommodation is reasonable if it is effective and its costs are not clearly disproportionate to the benefits that it will produce. A reasonable accommodation may include a change in such things as ordinary work rules, facilities, conditions, or schedules, but does not include elimination or change of essential job functions, assignment of essential job functions to other employees, or lower productivity standards. However, shifting marginal duties to other employees who can easily perform them is a reasonable accommodation.

1.3

2.2

Plaintiff bears the burden of proposing an accommodation and showing that the accommodation is objectively reasonable. An accommodation that eliminates an essential function of the job is not reasonable.

The ADA does not require employers to create new jobs or displace existing employees from their positions in order to accommodate a disabled individual.

Once an employer is aware of an employee's disability and an accommodation has been requested, the employer must discuss with the employee whether there is a reasonable accommodation that will permit him to perform the job. Both the employer and the employee or applicant must cooperate in this interactive process in good faith.

Now let's discuss damages. I will now give you instructions about how to calculate damages. You should not consider the fact that I am giving you this instruction as

suggestion — as suggesting any view of mine as to which party is entitled to your verdict in this case or that I think you should award any damages. Those are decision that are entirely for you to make. I am giving you these instructions solely for your guidance in the event that you find in favor of plaintiff on his claim against defendant — on his claims against defendant — on a claim against defendant. The fact that I do does not in any way mean that I think you should award any damages. That is entirely for you to decide.

If you find that defendant has violated plaintiff's

1.3

2.2

rights under the ADA, then you must determine the amount of damages that defendant's actions have caused plaintiff.

Plaintiff has the burden of proving damages by a preponderance of the evidence. You may award as actual damages an amount that reasonably compensates plaintiff for any lost wages and benefits, taking into consideration any increases in salary and benefits, including pension, that plaintiff would have received from defendant had plaintiff not been terminated.

Back pay damages, if any, apply from the time the plaintiff was placed out of work without pay until the date of your verdict. Collateral source benefits, such as employment compensation, Social Security benefits, and pension benefits received by the plaintiff should not — should not be offset or taken out of any back pay award the jury may deem appropriate.

The defendant has raised the defense that plaintiff had a duty to make reasonable efforts to obtain other employment after his separation from his employment with it in order to mitigate his damages. To do so, defendant must prove that plaintiff failed to mitigate his damages. Defendant may satisfy its burden only if it establishes that (1) that were substantially equivalent positions which were available, and (2) plaintiff failed to use reasonable care and diligence in seeking such positions. However, an employee who is unable to work due to a disability is not precluded from receiving back pay when the employer caused the disability.

2.2

At times throughout this trial you have heard reference to Social Security retirement benefits and Social Security disability benefits. You should not consider any such evidence in deciding whether to find for the plaintiff or for the defendant on any claim, and you should not consider any such evidence in calculating damages in the event that you find that the defendant violated the ADA.

You have heard testimony that the plaintiff planned to work until age 67. However, how long the plaintiff would have worked is disputed. Based on the evidence, you may find that the plaintiff would have worked until age 67, or you may find that the plaintiff would not have worked that long. Either way, the availability of Social Security disability or Social Security retirement benefits must have no impact on

your decisions concerning liability or damages. There is no evidence that the plaintiff qualifies for Social Security disability benefits or Social Security retirement benefits at this time. In particular, you should ignore Page 2 of Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 in this regard. This document is not evidence that the plaintiff presently qualifies for any Social Security benefits.

2.2

If plaintiff proves by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant terminated him in violation of the ADA, you may also calculate separately, as future damages, a monetary amount equal to the present value of the wages and benefits that plaintiff would have earned had he not been terminated for the period from the date of your verdict until the date when plaintiff would have voluntarily resigned or obtained other employment.

If you determine plaintiff is entitled to future lost wages, you must consider the following in arriving at an amount: First, plaintiff's prospects for another job; second, the length of time that it should take plaintiff to get such a job; third, the number of years remaining before plaintiff would most probably retire.

If you determine that an award of front pay is appropriate, you must also reduce any award to its present value by considering the interest plaintiff could earn on the amount of the award if plaintiff had made a relatively

risk-free investment. The reason that you must make this reduction is because an award of an amount representing future loss of earnings is more valuable to plaintiff if plaintiff receives it today than if plaintiff received it in the future when plaintiff would otherwise have earned it. It is more valuable because plaintiff can earn interest on it for the period of time between the date of the award and the date plaintiff would have earned the money. Thus, you should adjust the amount for -- of any award for future loss of earnings by the amount of interest that plaintiff can earn on that amount in the future.

2.2

Collateral source benefits such as employment compensation, Social Security benefits, and pension benefits received by the plaintiff should not be offset, taken out of, any back pay award -- excuse me, front pay award the jury may deem appropriate.

Let's discuss compensatory damages. If you find that plaintiff was discriminated against based on his disability, then you must determine an amount that you find by a preponderance of the evidence is fair compensation for his damages. You may award compensatory damages only for injuries that plaintiff proves were caused by defendant's allegedly wrongful conduct. The damages that you award must be fair compensation, no more and no less. You may award damages for any pain, suffering, or mental anguish that plaintiff

experienced as a consequence of defendant's alleged discrimination.

2.

2.1

2.2

No evidence of the monetary value of such intangible things as pain and suffering has been, or need be, introduced into evidence. You should consider the nature, character, and seriousness of any pain and suffering, inconvenience, or mental anguish that the plaintiff may have experienced, as well as the extent and duration or whether it required medical treatment. There is no exact standard for fixing the compensation to be awarded for these elements of damage; however, any award you make should be fair in light of the evidence presented at trial.

In determining the amount of damages that you decide to award, you should be guided by common sense. You must use sound judgment in fixing an award of damages, drawing reasonable inferences from the facts and evidence. You may not award damages based on sympathy, speculation, or guesswork. On the other hand, the law does not require that plaintiff prove the amount of his damages with mathematical precision but only with as much definiteness and accuracy as circumstances permit.

Plaintiff claims the acts of defendant were done with malice or reckless indifference to the plaintiff's federally protected rights, so as to entitle the plaintiff to an award of punitive damages in addition to the other damages.

In some cases punitive damages may be awarded for the purpose of punishing a defendant for its wrongful conduct and to deter others from engaging in similar wrongful conduct. However, an employer may not be held liable for punitive damages because of discriminatory acts on the part of its managerial employees where those acts by such employees are contrary to the employer's own good faith efforts to comply with the law by implementing policies and programs designed to prevent such unlawful discrimination in the workplace.

1.3

2.2

An award of punitive damages would be appropriate in this case only if you find for plaintiff and then further find from a preponderance of the evidence, first, that a management official of defendant personally acted with malice or reckless indifference to plaintiff's federally protected rights, and, second, that defendant itself had not acted in good faith — had not acted in a good faith attempt to comply with the law by adopting policies and procedures designed to prohibit such discrimination in the workplace.

If you find that punitive damages should be assessed against defendant, you may consider the financial resources of defendant in fixing the amount of such damages.

Now, if you return a verdict for plaintiff but he has failed to prove actual injury and therefore is not entitled to actual damages, then you must award nominal damages of one dollar. A person whose federal rights were

violated is entitled to a recognition of that violation, even if he suffered no actual injury. Nominal damages of one dollar are designed to acknowledge the deprivation of a federal right, even where no actual injury occurred. However, if you find actual injury, you must award actual damages, as I instructed you, rather than nominal damages.

2.2

In this case defendant claims it made good faith efforts to determine whether it could reasonably accommodate plaintiff. In cases where a discriminatory practice involves the reasonable accommodation provision of the ADA, actual and punitive damages may not be awarded where the employer demonstrates good faith efforts in consultation with the employee with a disability who has informed the covered entity that accommodation is needed, to identify and make a reasonable accommodation that would provide such individual with an equally effective opportunity and would not cause an undue hardship on the operation of the business.

To prove this defense to damages, defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant made a good faith effort, in consultation with plaintiff, to try to identify a reasonable accommodation.

When considering what damages, if any, to award plaintiff, you may not compensate him due to the fact that the plaintiff was injured at work. The ADA is not the mechanism by which an employee may seek compensation for a workplace

injury. Instead, Tennessee has a separate worker's compensation law that provides that exclusive remedy under which an employee may seek compensation for his on-the-job injury. Your job in this case is to determine whether the decision to terminate his employment was a violation of the ADA and, if so, what damages he suffered as a result of the loss of the employment.

2.2

Now, finally, any verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. In other words, your verdict must be unanimous. It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if can you do so without violence to the individual judgment.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict. You are the judges, the judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

Upon retiring to the jury room, you should first

```
select one of your number to act as your foreperson who will
 1
 2
    preside over your deliberations and will speak for you here in
 3
     court. A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.
 4
     When you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdict,
 5
     you will have your foreperson complete, date, and sign the
 6
     verdict form and then return to the courtroom. If during your
 7
     deliberations you should desire to communicate with the Court,
    please reduce your message or question to writing, signed by
 8
 9
     the foreperson, and pass the note to the courtroom deputy, who
10
     will bring it to my attention. I will then respond as
11
    promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you
12
     return to the courtroom so that I can address you orally.
13
     caution you, however, with regard to any message or question
14
     you might send, that you should never state or specify the
     vote of the jury at the time.
15
16
               I will now review the verdict form with you.
17
               You'll have a verdict form in the deliberation room,
18
     and it will have questions for you to answer, first about
19
     claims.
20
               "Claim Number 1. Do you find that plaintiff has
21
    proven by a preponderance of the evidence all of the elements
2.2
     required to establish that the defendant terminated the
    plaintiff because of his disability? There is a box for yes,
23
24
     a box for no. Check one.
```

"Claim 2.

25

Do you find that plaintiff has proven by

```
a preponderance of the evidence all of the elements required
 1
 2.
     to establish that defendant failed to engage in the
 3
     interactive process in good faith, as required under the
 4
     Americans with Disabilities Act?"
 5
               Again, a box for yes, a box for no.
 6
               "Claim 3. Do you find that plaintiff has proven by
     a preponderance of the evidence all of the elements required
 7
     to establish that defendant failed to accommodate plaintiff in
 8
 9
     compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act?"
10
               Again, a box for yes, a box for no.
               "Defenses. Number 4, Do you find that the defendant
11
12
    has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it
13
     demonstrated good faith efforts, in consultation with
14
    plaintiff, to identify a reasonable accommodation?
15
               There is a note that reads, "You cannot answer yes
16
     to Question Number 4 if you answered yes to Question Number
17
     2." Then there is a box for yes and a box for no.
18
               With regard to damages, there is a note, "If you
19
     answered no to Question Number 1, Question Number 2, and
20
     Question Number 3, stop and have the foreperson sign and date
21
     this form on Page 5. If you answered yes to Question
2.2
    Number 1, Question Number 2, or Question Number 3, proceed to
23
    Questions 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.
24
               "Question Number 5 is, Do you find that plaintiff
25
    has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should
```

```
be awarded back pay? There is a box for yes, a box for no.
 1
 2
     If your answer is yes, it reads, "The jury awards plaintiff
 3
     back pay damages in the amount of "blank "dollars in
 4
     connection with the following claims. Check all that apply.
 5
               "Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3.
 6
               "Question Number 6. Do you find that plaintiff has
 7
     proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should be
     awarded front pay? There's a box for yes, box for no.
 8
 9
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards plaintiff
     front pay damages in the amount of "blank "dollars in
10
11
     connection with the following claims. Check all that apply.
12
               "Claim 1, Claim Number 2, Claim Number 3.
               "Question 7. Do you find that plaintiff has proven
13
14
     by a preponderance of the evidence that he should be awarded
15
     compensatory damages?" Box for yes, box for no.
16
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards plaintiff
17
     compensatory damages in the amount of "blank "dollars in
18
     connection with the following claims. Check all that apply.
19
               "Claim Number 1, Claim Number 2, Claim Number 3.
20
               "Note: If you answered yes to Question 5, Question
21
     6, or Question 7, skip Question 8, and proceed to Question 9."
22
               Question 8 reads, "Do you find that plaintiff has
23
    proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should be
24
     awarded nominal damages? Box for yes, box for no.
25
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards plaintiff
```

```
nominal damages in the amount of "blank "dollars in connection
 1
 2.
     with the following claims. Check all that apply.
 3
               "Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3.
 4
               "Do you find -- to Question Number 9, do you find
 5
     that plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence
 6
     that he should be awarded punitive damages?"
 7
               There is a box for yes, a box for no.
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards punitive
 8
 9
     damages in the amount of "blank "dollars in connection with
10
     the following claims. Check all that apply.
11
               "Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3."
12
               The last page tells you, "Have the foreperson sign
     and date this form and return it to the court officer."
1.3
14
     is a blank for the foreperson's signature and a blank for the
15
     date.
16
               All right, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask
17
     you to go to the deliberation room. And once the courtroom
18
     deputy comes back and provides you with certain documents, you
19
     may begin your deliberation at that time.
20
               (The jury exited the courtroom, and the proceedings
2.1
               continued as follows:)
2.2
               THE COURT: All right. Have a seat, please.
23
               Okav.
                     I will give you an opportunity in a moment to
24
     do whatever you think you need to do to preserve objections,
25
     but on Page 12 I did not repeat the third paragraph. Does
```

```
anybody have an objection to that? It was exactly the same,
 1
 2.
     and I just noticed that.
 3
              MS. COLLINS: No objection.
 4
               THE COURT: All right.
 5
               The defense?
 6
              MR. WHITWORTH: No objection.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. I also, two or three times,
 8
     changed compensatory to actual. Did anybody have a problem
 9
     with that?
10
               MR. WHITWORTH: No, Your Honor.
               MS. COLLINS: Your Honor, the only concern that I had
11
12
     was when you read it in conjunction with the good faith effort.
1.3
               THE COURT: Which page are you on?
14
               MS. COLLINS: On Page 31. I think that time it
15
     should have been compensatory and punitive and not actual.
16
               THE COURT: Yeah. You're right. Let's bring the
17
     jury back in.
18
               (Brief pause.)
19
               THE COURT: I'm just going to read this one, okay?
20
              MS. COLLINS: Yes, Your Honor. Do they get a copy of
21
    this that goes back with them?
2.2
               THE COURT: We'll change it. We'll let you look at
23
    it.
24
              MS. COLLINS: I mean, it's written correctly.
25
    was just one of the ones that was verbally...
```

THE COURT: 1 Yeah. 2. (Brief pause.) 3 (The jury entered the courtroom, and the proceedings 4 continued as follows:) 5 THE COURT: Giving you some exercise this morning. 6 Thank you for coming back. 7 Before you start your deliberations, I want to correct one mistake I made. I'm going to reread a portion of 8 9 what I instructed you on before, and I want you to -- it will 10 be correct in the written instructions that you receive, but I 11 wanted to read it correctly as well. And I want you to follow 12 it as I'm about to read it and as it will be reflected on the 1.3 written copy. 14 In this case defendant claims that it made good 15 faith efforts to determine whether it could reasonably 16 accommodate plaintiff. In cases where a discriminatory 17 practice involves the reasonable accommodation provisions of 18 the ADA, compensatory and punitive damages may not be awarded 19 where the employer demonstrates good faith efforts, in 20 consultation with the employee with a disability who has 21 informed the covered entity that accommodation is needed, to 2.2 identify and make a reasonable accommodation that will provide 23 such individual with an equally effective opportunity and 24 would not cause an undue hardship on the operation of the 25 business. To prove this defense to damages, the defendant has

```
the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that
 1
 2
     defendant made a good faith effort, in consultation with
 3
     plaintiff, to try to identify a reasonable accommodation.
 4
               Okay. So now that you have this correct version of
 5
     that portion of the instructions, I will once again ask you to
 6
     retire. And once you get access to the documents that
 7
     Ms. Hinton is about to give you, you may begin your
     deliberations.
 8
 9
               (The jury exited the courtroom, and the proceedings
               continued as follows:)
10
11
               THE COURT: All right. Good catch, Ms. Collins.
12
     Thank you.
13
               All right. So let me just review what nits we're
14
     going to correct.
15
               On Page 12 we're going to take out the third
16
     paragraph, the repeat.
17
               On Page 27 back should say front. And I said
18
     "front" when I read it to them, but I'm going to change back
19
     to front on Page 27.
20
               And I am going to, on 28, change -- at the
21
     second-to-last line change their to his.
2.2
               On Page 29, third line, compensatory will be
23
     substituted by actual.
24
               And that's it, I believe. Anybody have a problem
     with any of those?
25
```

```
(Brief pause.)
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: Defense?
 3
               Plaintiff?
 4
               MR. WHITWORTH: No objection to those changes.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 6
               MR. WHITWORTH: Out of an abundance of caution, we
 7
     respectfully renew our previously stated objections.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay.
 9
               Ms. Collins, anything further?
10
               MS. COLLINS: No, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Okay.
12
               MS. COLLINS: No objection.
1.3
               THE COURT: All right. There is also a typographical
14
            On Page 2 it said "is" instead of his. We'll fix that
15
     as well.
              Okav?
16
               All right. We'll quickly modify these instructions,
17
     and then Ms. Hinton will take them back for us. Is there
18
     anything else until we begin waiting, or continue to wait?
19
     Any other issues that you want to raise?
20
               MS. COLLINS: No, Your Honor.
2.1
               THE COURT: All right. Stay close. Do we have cell
2.2
    numbers for everybody? If we don't, will you leave them with
    Ms. Hinton?
23
24
               MS. COLLINS: We will.
25
                           I'll let you know when we hear something.
               THE COURT:
```

```
1
     We're in recess.
 2.
               (Recess for deliberations.)
 3
               THE COURT: All right. Counsel --
 4
               Heith, I grabbed the wrong document. Get the
 5
     question.
 6
               THE CLERK:
                           Sir?
 7
               THE COURT:
                           Go get the question.
               We have a question from the jury.
 8
 9
               (Brief pause.)
               THE COURT: All right. Here's the question.
10
                                                              I want
     counsel -- well, come up. Why don't you-all come up.
11
                                                             I just
12
     noticed...
1.3
               (A sidebar discussion was held between the Court and
14
               counsel, as follows:)
15
               THE COURT: Here's the question. I was about to say,
16
     "Regarding questions, if we decide to award in plaintiff's
17
     favor, is the amount awarded once for all three claims, or
18
     awarded for each Claim 1, 2, and 3?"
19
               Right before I started to read it -- I think that's
20
     an S, but it could be a 5, "Regarding Question 5" or
21
     "Regarding questions." So I think I'm going to ask -- get --
2.2
     send a communication back asking them what the second --
23
     whether that's "Questions" or "Question 5," and then we'll
24
     answer this question for them. Okay?
25
               MR. HARRIS: Okay.
```

```
THE COURT: Everybody on board with that,
 1
 2.
    Ms. Collins?
 3
              MS. COLLINS: Yeah. I mean, you're just getting
 4
     clarification, right?
 5
               THE COURT: Yeah. I'm not telling them --
 6
               MS. COLLINS: Okay. Yeah. I mean, I'm this close to
 7
     being slightly brain dead. (Indicating.) So I'm trying to
 8
     like...
 9
     (IN OPEN COURT)
10
               THE COURT: We need to ask the jury, the second -- I
     don't want -- we're going to do it in writing, but the second
11
     word is either "Questions" or "Question 5," and I can't tell
12
13
     for sure. So we're going to send a question back. Do you have
14
     a form going back? Do you have it, Heith? Do you have the
     form?
15
16
               THE LAW CLERK: I'll-- Do you want me to type it up?
17
               THE COURT: Just say -- let's ask, "Does your
18
     communication begin with the words 'Regarding --' quote,
19
     'Regarding questions,' end quote, or, quote, 'Regarding
20
     Question 5, '" end quote, question mark.
2.1
               THE LAW CLERK: How many copies?
2.2
               THE COURT: Make three copies.
23
               (Brief pause.)
24
               THE COURT: Everybody on board with that?
25
               MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
1
               MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir.
 2
               THE COURT:
                           The only -- I'm just going to change
 3
     "Foreperson" to "Judge" and sign it and give it to them.
 4
               MS. COLLINS:
                            Okay.
 5
               (Brief pause) --
 6
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hinton, let the attorneys
 7
     see that before you -- just let them make sure they're okay
 8
     with the --
 9
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes.
                                            I'm sorry.
10
               THE COURT: -- signed copy.
11
               (Brief pause.)
12
               MS. COLLINS: Yes, ma'am.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Harris, Ms. Collins, both
14
     good?
15
               MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
16
               MS. COLLINS: Yes, Your Honor.
17
               (Brief pause.)
18
               THE COURT: I don't think this will take long to
19
     answer that, so...
20
               (Brief pause.)
21
               THE COURT: So their response is, "Regarding
22
     question, no S, no 5." I'm going to ask them just to rewrite
23
     their question.
24
               MR. HARRIS: Can they type it?
25
               THE COURT: All right. Just --
```

```
1
               MS. COLLINS: So the -- so we could just disregard
 2
     the first part of that and just read the question?
 3
               THE COURT: I don't -- I mean, I'll let you look at
 4
            I don't think this -- I don't think that they answered
 5
     our question, at least the one I asked. So let's say, "Please
 6
     rewrite your question."
 7
               MS. COLLINS: Neatly, not cursive.
 8
               THE COURT: No, say, "Rewrite your communication,"
 9
     instead of "question." "Please rewrite your communication."
10
               THE LAW CLERK: "Original communication"?
               THE COURT: No.
11
12
               (Brief pause.)
1.3
               THE COURT: Ms. Hinton, will you let them see that?
14
     The attorneys.
15
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Oh, the attorneys.
                                                          Sorry.
16
               (Brief pause.)
17
               MR. HARRIS: Okay.
18
              MS. COLLINS: Yes, ma'am.
19
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay.
20
               (Brief pause.)
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Now they said, "Please disregard.
2.2
     Thank you." So let's wait and see if they ask anything else in
23
     writing. They have -- they did ask Ms. Hinton for a
24
     calculator, and the usual practice is to provide that.
25
    having one brought down. We should have that in a moment.
```

```
1
               (Brief pause.)
 2.
               THE COURT: Anybody want to inspect the calculator?
 3
               MR. HARRIS: (Moving head from side to side.)
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. We're going to provide the jury a
 5
     calculator. And we're in recess again. Thank you.
 6
               (Brief recess.)
               THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I've
 7
     been handed a note that we have a verdict, the jury's reached a
 8
 9
     verdict. So my plan is to call them back in, when Ms. Hinton
10
     gets back, and receive the verdict. Is there anything else to
11
     do before we do that?
12
               MS. COLLINS: (Moving head from side to side.)
13
               THE COURT: All right.
14
               (Brief pause.)
15
               (The jury entered the courtroom, and the proceedings
16
               continued as follows:)
17
               THE COURT: All right. It's my understanding-- Have
18
              It's my understanding that the jury has reached a
     a seat.
19
              I would -- I believe Ms. Post is the foreperson.
     verdict.
20
               Ms. Post, has the jury unanimously agreed to a
2.1
     verdict?
2.2
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: You have? Why don't you stand and answer
23
24
     audibly so we can pick it up for the record.
25
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor, we've reached a
```

```
1
     verdict.
 2.
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Will you hand
 3
     that verdict form to Ms. Hinton, please.
 4
               (Brief pause.)
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 6
               Ms. Hinton, will you please read the verdict.
 7
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: "Verdict Form.
               "Question Number 1. Claim 1. Do you find that the
 8
 9
     plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence all of
10
     the elements required to establish that the defendant
11
     terminated plaintiff because of his disability?
12
               "Yes.
13
               "Claim Number 2. Do you find that the plaintiff has
14
     proven by a preponderance of the evidence all of the elements
15
     required to establish defendant failed to engage in the
16
     interactive process in good faith as required under Americans
17
     with Disabilities Act?
18
               "Yes.
19
               "Claim Number 3. Do you find that the plaintiff has
20
     proven by a preponderance of evidence all of the elements
21
     required to establish that the defendant failed to accommodate
2.2
     plaintiff in his compliance with the Americans with
23
     Disabilities Act?
24
               "Yes.
               "Question Number 4. Do you find that the defendant
25
```

```
has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it has
 1
 2
     demonstrated good faith efforts, in consulting with the
 3
     plaintiff, to identify a reasonable accommodation?
 4
               "No.
 5
               "Damages. Do you find that the defendant [sic] has
 6
     proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should be
 7
     awarded back pay?
 8
               "Yes.
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards the
 9
10
     plaintiff back pay damages in the amount of $181,522.61.
11
               "Claim Number 1, Claim Number 2, and Claim Number 3.
12
               "Do you find the def- -- the plaintiff has proven by
13
     a preponderance of the evidence that he should be awarded
14
     front pay?
15
               "Yes.
16
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards the
17
     plaintiff front pay damages in the amount of $315,000 in
18
     connection with the following claims," and they checked all
19
     that apply, and that's Claim Number 1, Claim Number 2, and
20
     Claim Number 3.
21
               "Question Number 7. Do you find that the plaintiff
22
     has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should
23
     be awarded compensatory damages?
24
               "Yes.
               "If your answer is yes, the jury awards the
25
```

```
plaintiff compensatory damages in the amount of 92,000 in
 1
 2
     connection with the following claims, " they checked all that
 3
     applied, "Claim Number 1, Claim Number 2, Claim Number 3.
 4
               "Question Number 8. Do you find that the plaintiff
 5
    has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should
 6
    be awarded nominal damages?"
 7
               Nothing checked there.
               "Question Number 9. Do you find that the plaintiff
 8
 9
    has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he should
10
    be awarded punitive damages?
11
               "No."
12
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Hinton.
13
               Does any party want the jury -- to poll the jury?
14
               MS. COLLINS: No, Your Honor. We're good.
15
               MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Thank you.
17
               Ms. Hinton, will you please file and record the
18
     verdict.
19
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, thank
21
     you, thank you all very much. I know this has taken quite a
2.2
     chunk out of your week. You have just a few minutes left of
23
     the workweek. But you've been very patient. I could tell that
24
    you were paying very close attention to everything that
25
     occurred. And I know that on behalf of the parties and the
```

```
lawyers and myself and all of my staff, we definitely
 1
 2
     appreciate that.
 3
               This is an important role that you play.
 4
    Ms. Elliott may know more about this than other jurors, given
 5
     her husband's profession, but this is one of the things that
 6
     keeps our nation strong, keeps our community strong. This is
 7
     our way of resolving disputes without resorting to other ways
     of resolving disputes that haven't worked nearly as well in
 8
 9
     the past. And I sincerely appreciate you, each one of you,
10
     for your patience and your work.
11
               I'm going to discharge you. If you would wait for
     just a moment in the jury room, I will -- I'd like to come and
12
13
    meet you and bid you a good weekend. So give us just a minute
14
     to wrap up here. I'll go ahead and dismiss you.
15
               (The jury exited the courtroom, and the proceedings
16
               continued as follows:)
17
               THE COURT: All right. I'll remind you, Counsel,
18
     that -- about Local Rule 48.1 that governs contact with jurors.
19
     So, please note that, be familiar with that Rule 48.1, and make
20
     sure that you follow it.
21
               Is there anything else we need to take up today?
2.2
    know there will probably be motions later, but is there
23
     anything else today that we need to do?
24
               MR. HARRIS: Not today, Your Honor.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
```

1	Ms. Collins?
2	MS. COLLINS: No, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. As I said
4	before, all the lawyers did a very good job. I really
5	appreciate the way you handled yourself, the way you worked
6	together. We don't always see that. I don't want to rank you
7	as a group on and compare you to everybody else, but I will
8	tell you that with regard to your skills as advocates and your
9	professionalism, that you're easily at the top, and I truly,
10	truly, appreciate that.
11	MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Judge.
12	THE COURT: So we're adjourned, and we will wait to
13	hear from you. Thank you very much.
14	END OF PROCEEDINGS
15	
16	
17	
18	I, Elizabeth B. Coffey, do hereby certify that I
19	reported in machine shorthand the proceedings in the
20	above-styled cause, and that this transcript is an accurate
21	record of said proceedings.
22	
23	s/Elizabeth B. Coffey
24	Elizabeth B. Coffey, Official Court Reporter
25	